

STAT

[redacted] - *Chen*

Approved For Release 2004/05/21 : CIA-RDP80M00772A000100020021-5

February 14, 1978

MEMORANDUM

TO: Director of Central Intelligence
[redacted]
FROM:
SUBJECT: Providing Congress with ZBB information

In response to your query, the intent of the letter to McIntyre of 8 February was to indicate that we would show the way the budget was sliced into ZBB decision units, but not show the priorities assigned to each of the units.

STAT

Approved For Release 2004/05/21 : CIA-RDP80M00772A000100020021-5

STAT

Approved For Release 2004/05/21 : CIA-RDP80M00772A000100020021-5

Approved For Release 2004/05/21 : CIA-RDP80M00772A000100020021-5

Washington, D.C. 20505

FEB 8 1978

The Honorable James T. McIntyre
Acting Director
Office of Management and Budget
Washington, D.C. 20503

Dear Jim:


I am responding to your comment at the Cabinet Meeting of 16 January concerning the provision of Zero Base Budget information to Congress during the FY 1979 budget hearings.

The committees which will review the National Foreign Intelligence Program Budget will be provided information in our ZBB Consolidated Decision Unit format, as well as by major program within the National Foreign Intelligence Program. The Congressional Justification Books prepared by individual elements of the community are structured along ZBB lines.

I am prepared to provide more detailed information by individual ZBB decision unit, should it be requested in the course of testimony.

I do not propose to provide decision unit rankings, since I feel these are internal to the process within the Executive Branch by which we arrived at the budget the President has sent to Congress. I am, of course, ready to address the priorities reflected by the budget to whatever extent any of the committees might desire.

Yours,



STANFIELD TURNER

SUBJECT: Providing ZBB Information to Congress

Distribution:

Orig.--Addressee (J.T. McIntyre)

1--DCI/ER
1--A-D/DCI/IC
1--D/OPP/ICS
1--D/OPEI/ICS
1--C/SS/ICS
1--IC Registry
1--OPBD Chrono
1--OPBD Subject

STAT DCI/ICS/OPBD/ [redacted] :lah/1/24/78

Approved For Release 2004/05/21 : CIA-RDP80M00772A000100020021-5
THE DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20505

FEB 8 1978

MEMORANDUM FOR: NFIP Program Managers
SUBJECT: Providing ZBB Information to Congress

1. At a recent Cabinet meeting, Jim McIntyre stated that it has been left to individual departments to determine what information on ZBB is to be released to Congress.
2. Attached for your information is my letter to Jim expressing my intentions on the subject. I believe the letter also serves as useful guidance in the course of preparation for the upcoming budget hearings.



STANSFIELD TURNER

Attachment:
Letter to Director, Office of
Management and Budget, signed
by DCI, dated

STAT

Approved For Release 2004/05/21 : CIA-RDP80M00772A000100020021-5

Approved For Release 2004/05/21 : CIA-RDP80M00772A000100020021-5

7-12 STAT

Approved For Release 2004/05/21 : CIA-RDP80M00772A000100020021-5

NOTES RE: ADP STUDY

P. III.

In the second paragraph it is not clear whether the actual increase in ADP costs between 1970 and 1978 has been two percent or two percent per year. It would help to perhaps include the constant dollar figure. You might add a sentence or two that says that the productivity of ADP resources has risen very rapidly during this period.

P. IV

At the top it is not clear whether the investment of [redacted] represents real investment or outlay on both operations and investment.

STAT

P. IV just before paragraph 1.4

You might note that telecommunications is making it possible to collect the same information with a smaller overseas work force and computer internetting is making raw data available to a larger analytical community.

P. V

The first sentence is a red flag. The DCI does not have management control over all of these resources and so we need to think of a new way to phrase that. I would propose "the DCI's near-term task is to make sure that resources expended on these diverse information handling capabilities are spent efficiently" or some such formulation.

P. VI

I suggest that in paragraph 3 you delete "will plan centrally".

P. VIII

First bullet: don't establish CISO as a central planning organization. Just establish it.

Same page

Last bullet: I don't understand the repeated references throughout to the CIHS. I don't know what the invention of that adds to the discussion.

Last paragraph: Again central planning in a long-term plan for ADP-T. These are probably unrealizable. The table Intelligence Program Historical Trends footnote 3 - I don't know what SPAF and SPN are. Why don't you define these.

Approved For Release 2004/05/21 : CIA-RDP80M00772A000100020021-5

Page Two
Notes: re ADP Study

Page 3. Paragraph 1.2

This is really very muddled. The [redacted] of total assets refers to a number of different years and so is really a meaningless sum. In any case, that's not the current value of the assets since one would have to allow for depreciation in order to put it on a comparable basis with the Fortune Magazine directory of private firms' assets. Why not just say that the intelligence community is doubtless the world's largest user of computers?

STAT

Page 7. Paragraph 1.11

The last two sentences. It is not clear which large class of files is not reported on further.

Page 10. Paragraph 2.1

I think the reference to the study for the EEC is irrelevant. The point is that with the expansion of the task at hand, the requirement for real time and near real time analysis, and the declining levels of personnel computer assistance of many different kinds is obviously essential.

Paragraph 2.2 Sentence at the the bottom of p. 10.

I think the preaching about functional interdependence has got a little too much of a hortatory tone.

Paragraph 2.3 is very troublesome. We are not going to have a coherent system that consists of all the assets funded through the NFIP. We will look for better ways to coordinate those assets and we will try to achieve a balance between required performance and cost, but whether we will get a "system" is certainly unclear and I don't think the CISO will be able to settle that.

Page 13. Paragraph 3.1.

I think this is just dead wrong. In supporting their own departmental missions, the various agencies of the Intelligence Community have in fact been carrying out the overall mission of the Intelligence Community. What they have not done is adjust at the margin to make the changes required--probably minor--that would make their interrelation more effective. The concept of coordinated resources management across the entire Community has not come to any focus at all.

SECRET

Approved For Release 2004/05/21 : CIA-RDP80M00772A000100020021-5

Page 3
Notes on ADP Study
February 13, 1978

P. 14, same paragraph.

It is not clear yet that an overall planning process is required, but a supporting information system is indeed required, but let's not call it a management information system. Those things are in bad--justifiably bad--odor.

Paragraph 3.3 should reflect the current ambiguity and our uncertainty about what a plan would presently look like. The level of detail appropriate is not yet clear and the period of time over which planning would be meaningful is not yet clear, and I am not sure that we want to specify the responsibility for that plan would rest with CSIO. I also do not want to include the proposed DCI directive. I think the people who commented that it was inappropriate for inclusion in the Congressional document were correct. For example, an important point that remains unresolved is whether there should be a plan for ADP or whether ADP consideration should be included in documents like SIGINT and Imagery plans.

Page 21, top of the page.

Is it really true that the problem of security is becoming more difficult with the proliferation of hardware? Not particularly well informed--is that vendors are moving toward greater commonality of systems. And I don't understand the assertion at the bottom of the page that persons with access to terminals are held to higher standards of security than those with access to other forms of classified material. Could you explain more fully?

Page 24.

I find the assertion that merely changing country codes would cost several million dollars in reprogramming incredible. There exist computer routines for sifting FORTRAN and other programs so that such changes can be made by machine. Are we sure of our facts?

Top of page 25.

Again we have the CIHS. It's a chimera.

Paragraph 3.17

To automate or not to automate seems like a false choice. The real question is how much. It's not a binary choice.

Approved For Release 2004/05/21 : CIA-RDP80M00772A000100020021-5

Paragraph 3.18

It's not clear that the choice between off the shelf and specially designed systems is best implemented and enforced through appropriate actions at the community management level. We really want to make sure that people at lower levels look at the choices recognizing that they will be reexamined at the community level.

Paragraph 3.19

I'm not sure the first sentence is correct.

Bottom of p. 28.

The last two or three sentences seem like hortatory but vacuous assertions.

Paragraph 3.21

The reference to the justification books in such complimentary fashion seems self-serving considering our audience. They also seem unwarranted given the lack of concrete progress that we have to cite in this report.

Paragraph 3.21 on page 30, the last couple of sentences.

The argument for a central planning office seems inappropriate for this audience, although the last sentence seems right.

Paragraph 3.24

Again the offending CHIS. Figure 3.1 is not explained in the text and something I simply fail to understand. Somebody may have once found it useful but I find it merely mystifying.

Paragraph 3.31

Do we really want to task CSIO with responsibility for developing an official plan and do so formally for the Congress? I doubt it. I would delete paragraph 3.32 and 3.33 as well as all of the non-underlined section of 3.34.

Paragraph 3.36 advertises the planning guidance as doing something I don't think it does. 3.37 is also more grandiose than we are likely to be able to deliver on right away. I am not sure what Figure 3.3 adds to the discussion. I think we want to talk about section 4 on conclusions and decide whether the promises here are ones we really want to make and whether they are appropriate for this document. I will have a better feel for that after I have talked with [redacted]

STAT